



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Cen

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,526	12/20/2005	Kenji Ookura	P28917	9812
7055 7590 03/28/2007 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			EXAMINER GUSHI, ROSS N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/28/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 03/28/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/561,526	Applicant(s) OOKURA, KENJI	
	Examiner Ross N. Gushi	Art Unit 2833	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/28/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. First, throughout the specification, applicant uses the directional term "longitudinal" in a way that is confusing and unclear and contradictory. First, applicant states that the prior art metal fittings 56 are press-fit "in a widthwise direction." Page 2. Then fittings 76 are inserted "in a longitudinal direction." Page 3. Then, since the fittings are inserted "in a longitudinal direction" the "longitudinal direction becomes larger." Page 5. None of this makes sense when compared to the drawings. Likewise in the claims, the limitations regarding "metal fittings integrally inserted into both end portions thereof in longitudinal direction" and fittings "formed to protrude outward from both side walls of the plug groove in longitudinal direction" and "a coupling portion connecting between the fixed portions and embedded into an end portion of the socket body in the longitudinal direction" are unclear and confusing in light of the specification and drawings. The limitations are given little weight.

Regarding claims 1-10, the term "integrally inserted" is confusing and ambiguous. What is "integrally inserted?" In claim 1, the limitation regarding "a pair of the socket reinforcing metal fittings is formed to protrude . . ." is confusing since it is not clear

Art Unit: 2833

whether this pair is referring to the pair of socket reinforcing metal fittings recited previously. The limitations relating to these terms are given little weight.

Regarding claim 3, “the second contact portion of the header post along heightwise direction of the header to a second face opposite to the first face” lacks antecedent basis and is unclear and confusing. The limitation is given little weight. Likewise, for the claims dependent on claim 3, the limitations can be given little weight since it is not clear beginning with claim 1 what is being claimed.

Regarding claims 1-14, the directional indicators, such as longitudinal direction, widthwise direction, and heightwise direction throughout the specification and claims are ambiguous and unclear and contradictorily used with respect to each other and with respect to what is shown in the drawings, thus the limitations regarding these terms can be given little weight.

Regarding claim 11, a “manufacturing method of a connector” “characterized by comprising: the plural pairs of header posts are; a process for forming conductive materials” makes no sense whatsoever grammatically and is completely incomprehensible. For purposes of analysis, the claim is treated as meaning a method of making a connector as taught in the prior art.

The preceding are examples of the ambiguities and inconsistencies that exist throughout the claims. Applicant should review all of the claims and make corrections where appropriate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2833

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in —

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a);

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igarashi et al. ("Igarashi") in view of Kihara et al. ("Kihara"). Igarashi discloses a connector including reinforcing metal fittings 30 and 32. To the extent that applicant might be attempting to claim that the fittings are insert-molded into the housing, Igarashi discloses this in paragraph 0050. To the extent that Igarashi paragraph 0050 might be ambiguously written, Kihara discloses a connector including pins 35 which are analogous to fittings 30 and 32 in Igarashi. Kihara discloses that the pin 35 may be press fit or insert molded into the housing. At the time of the invention, it would have

Art Unit: 2833

been obvious to either press fit or insert mold the Igarashi metal fittings into the housing. The choice of whether to press fit or insert mold the fittings would have been a matter of engineering design choice, motivated by well known considerations such as ease of assembly, stability, durability, etc., such considerations being well known in the art. Likewise, the method of manufacturing such a connector would have been obvious.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ross Gushi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2005. If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley, can be reached at 571-272-2800 extension 33. The phone number for the Group's facsimile is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ROSS GUSHI
PRIMARY EXAMINER